

to support recognizing the rights of a child or marriage for same-sex couples.

That is a French commission examining other European countries that have legalized same-sex unions saying this is not good for France or for the raising of the next generation.

In addition to these sources, some of the most influential sociologists in Europe agree that same-sex marriage undermines the traditional institution of marriage, even if they welcome the change. So, in other words, they are saying we might welcome the change, but this is going to hurt marriage. They agree that same-sex marriage doesn't reinforce marriage, as many of its proponents argue but, rather, upends marriage and helps foster acceptance for a variety of other forms, such as single parenting, cohabitation, and multiple partner unions, which only serve to weaken traditional marriage. This is what happens when you move away from your standard of marriage being the union of a man and a woman. It weakens the institution and moves in a lot of other types of arrangements.

Britain's Anthony Giddens, one of the most influential sociologists in all of Europe, wrote that modern marriage is being emptied of any meaning beyond the emotional bonding of adults, something he quotes as the "pure relationship." This notion of the pure relationship is being widely used by European social scientists to explain why so many parents now avoid marriage. Having a child is an experiment in an adult relationship that could possibly lead to marriage, rather than a reason to get married in the first place. It is clear that the institution of marriage has been defined down. It is simply a shared affection between two adults.

This is precisely how the advocates of same-sex marriage define marriage—no intrinsic connection to marriage. European sociologists say that a whole host of changes, like single parenting, cohabitation, and multiple partner unions, point to the unraveling of marriage as an institution designed to keep mothers and fathers together and for the sake of their children.

German sociologists, Ulrich Beck and Elizabeth Beck-Gernsheim, also highly contend that raising rates of parental cohabitation and out-of-wedlock births indicate that marriage, while seemingly alive, is in fact dying. The old notions of marriage and family are giving way to domestic situations in which individuals make up their own rules. Individual choice hollows out the old institutions, such as marriage and family, that used to guide our choices. These authors actually embrace and celebrate the instability of the brave new family system, holding that family disillusion teaches children a hard, but necessary, lesson about our new social world.

Is that the sort of message we want to send? It is the message that is coming through the courts if we don't define this legislatively. The work of

Norwegian sociologist Keri Moxnes, frequently used by European social scientists, is to put the movement in context. Moxnes welcomes same-sex marriage not as a way of ratifying marriage itself but as an innovation that affirms and advances marriage's ongoing decline. She defines marriage as being an increasingly empty institution.

Is that the message we want to send? In the U.S., many sociologists are of the same opinion. One argues that these wrenching social changes disrupt conventional sexual and domestic relations and undermine traditional marriages, but also believes that all of these are signs of the decline of the traditional family. From same-sex unions, to births, to cohabiting parents, to mothers who are single by choice, release individuals from the constraint of traditional marriage.

I want to conclude on that point to reaffirm what is really taking place here, and that is the redefining of a fundamental institution. We can say this is somehow a politicized debate, that it is not important. But from what we are seeing in countries that have taken up this debate, it is clearly important. It goes to the heart of the fundamental institution of marriage and weakens it further. It is an institution that we want to support, and this move destroys it further, takes it down further. That has been the research results that have taken place in Europe.

This is a big debate. It is a big and important problem and issue. We should not kid ourselves about what this is about by saying we don't really need to do this now. If we don't do it and it is redefined by the courts, that is the track we are on—tearing down this institution around which we have built families. Is that what the American people want to do? We have seen them vote in 45 States saying, no, we want marriage as the union of a man and a woman.

We should not kid ourselves. This is seriously about the future of the culture of the United States.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the mo-

tion to proceed to Calendar No. 435, S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage.

Bill Frist, Wayne Allard, Jim Bunning, Conrad Burns, Richard Burr, Tom Coburn, Jon Kyl, Craig Thomas, George Allen, Judd Gregg, Johnny Isakson, David Vitter, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Jeff Sessions, John Ensign, Rick Santorum.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the live quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL WILLIAM JAY LEUSINK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a brave American who has made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our country. LCpl William Leusink died on May 22 when he struck an improvised explosive device while on a dismounted patrol in the Al Anbar Province in Iraq. Lance Corporal Leusink was a marine who was assigned to the Marine Corps Base in Kaneohe Bay, HI. He was 21 years old.

I would ask that all Americans join me today, and add to the more than 1,100 Iowans who attended his funeral, in remembering and honoring Lance Corporal Leusink. The loss of this courageous and patriotic American is felt throughout Iowa and in particular the town of Maurice where he grew up and graduated from Sioux Center High School. My thoughts and prayers are with Lance Corporal Leusink's wife, Miranda, his parents, Bill and Elaine, his brother and two sisters as well as all those other family and friends who are grieving the loss of this young man.

Lance Corporal Leusink, who I understand was known as "B. Jay" among family and friends, will be remembered for his faith, athleticism, and patriotism. His faith was especially important to him. Just as he often took with him to the football field his favorite verse, Philippians 4:13, written on tape, it was this faith that led him to enlist to serve his country.

Pastor Wayne Sneller of the First Reformed Church of Maurice said, "B. Jay always wanted to be a Marine and to serve his country. He believed in what he was doing and knew that the Lord was going to be with him."

In an e-mail to the pastor, Lance Corporal Leusink had written, "I know where I am going. I enlisted for a reason, and that was to make a difference."